

the United States, and ought to be resisted at every hazard, and by every exertion.

Resolved, That the Governor be requested to appoint a number of delegates to meet at Nashville in Southern convention, in June next.

## THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 21, 1850.

DEBATES IN CONGRESS.—We have no room this week for notices of the speeches of Messrs. Fitch, Root, and Mann, in reply to the numerous speeches in support of the claims of Slavery. We shall attend to them in our next.

THE CRISIS.—May we not ask our friends to renew their exertions for the extension of the circulation of the *Era* in this important crisis. Never before was it so vital to have the Public correctly and fully informed of the movements in Congress. Of the four political papers issued in this place, the *Era* is the only one which presents and advocates the views and claims of the non-slaveholders of the country on this great question of Slavery.

No. 155 of the *Era*.—Those subscribers who do not file their *Era*, and have copies of No. 155 on hand, will confer a favor by remitting them to this office.

### NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

WILLIAM W. WOODWORTH, administrator of William Woodworth, deceased, in now petitioning Congress to extend his Patent for a Plowing Machine for another long term. All those who have the monopoly, and the injustice of the *REPEATED EXTENSIONS* of that Patent, are requested to send to their representatives against the same to their respective Senators and Representatives in Congress, without any delay.

Feb. 14-38

### DEBATE IN THE SENATE ON THE 11TH.

#### THE RIGHT OF PETITION—THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION.

We present on our fourth page some account of the Debate in the Senate on the 11th of February, on the question of receiving a petition offered by Mr. Hale on a former day, in relation to a dissolution of the Union. The petition set forth that the Federal Constitution, in supporting Slavery, violated the Divine law; that the experiment of uniting Slavery and Freedom under one Government had failed; and closed by respectfully asking "Congress to propose, without delay, some plan for the immediate and peaceful dissolution of the American Union."

The petition was respectful in its language and tone. The signers to it did not ask Congress to dissolve the Union, but to propose some plan for its dissolution, evidently under the impression that such a movement was within its constitutional powers. Is this impression correct?

Article 5th of the Constitution provides as follows:

"Congress, whenever two-thirds of either House shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution; or, on the application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing amendments, which in either case shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as parts of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress; provided that no amendments which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The signers to this petition have doubtless noticed that in the proceedings of Legislative bodies it is common for a member to move to amend a bill or resolution, by striking out all after the enacting clause, or the word resolved, and inserting a substitute; and, observing that, by the Constitution, Congress, by a majority of two-thirds in each House, is empowered to propose amendments, they may have inferred that it could propose, to amend by substituting a substitute, contemplating, for example, the formation of two separate Unions.

No Senator adverted to this possibility; none seemed to think of inquiring how far Congress could go in proposing amendments. All who opposed the reception of the petition assumed that it prayed Congress to *abolish the Union*—a thing so manifestly and wholly beyond its power, that it was right to reject the paper at once. This was the assumption made by Messrs. Davis and Webster of Massachusetts—an assumption utterly groundless, as the petition asked simply that Congress would prepare a plan of dissolution.

This is manifestly and wholly beyond its power! It is a question with two sides—it admits of argument. The language of the article respecting amendments, quoted above, raises a presumption, at least, that Congress, by the requisite majorities, is competent to submit such a proposition. What, then, was the dictate of common sense, in relation to the petition? To receive it; and, if no dissolution prevailed to act upon it in any way, to lay it upon the table; but, if there was, to refer it to an appropriate committee, with suitable instructions. Should the Senate decide that it had not the power to execute the request of the petition, that decision would be a good reason for denying the prayer, but no reason at all for refusing to receive the petition.

Could we be surprised at any notions put forth in Congress, we should be surprised at the notions of several learned Senators concerning the Right of Petition. Judge Underwood denied two limitations, as he called them, upon this right—1st, Want of power in the body petitioned, 2d, Exemption of the persons petitioning from the operation of the exercise of power petitioned for. Where Congress had no right to grant the prayer of a petition, it ought not to receive it; nor ought it to receive a petition praying for action or non-action, where neither could affect the petitioners! On one or the other of these grounds he would refuse to receive nearly all the petitions touching the Slavery Question. For example, he would reject one, praying the abolition of the inter-State slave trade, in consequence of a want of power to act on that subject; and another, praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, because such abolition could in no way affect the petitioners residing out of the District.

These would be reasons to urge against granting the prayer of a petition, but no reasons at all for refusing to hear it. To refuse to hear, is a violation or abridgement of the right of petition; and is not demanded by the rights or dignity of Congress. To refuse to grant, after hearing, is no invasion of the right of petition; is a sufficient safeguard of the rights and dignity of Congress, and of the provisions of the Constitution. The examples referred to show the unreasonableness of any such limitation, limitations unknown to the Constitution, and never recognised by any Government. In regard to the inter-State slave trade, Public Opinion is not settled. It is a subject admitting of apparently strong arguments for and against. Mr. Underwood doubtless denies the power, but it would cost him an elaborate argument to demonstrate that he does not exist.

Then as to Slavery in the District of Columbia: its abolition, the slaveholders of the States say, would be a blow at the stability of their peculiar institution; although not citizens here, their rights, they insist, would be indirectly damaged. On the other hand, the People of the North say, that as Slavery exists in which they are not engaged, they are involved in the legislative support of what they believe to be wrong. Besides, they say, the advantage to the supporters of Slavery, and fetters their freedom. For these and other reasons they insist upon its abolition, asserting that it would exert the most favorable influence on their rights and interests.

Now, here are conflicting demands, conflicting interests—but Mr. Underwood, without paying the least attention to them, says that petitioners concerning Slavery in the District of Columbia

beyond its limits ought not to be received, because the existence or abolition of Slavery here affects nobody but those living here!

Members of Congress are but agents of the People. Their position does not release them from the obligation of giving reasons for their acts. Nothing is more common than differences of opinion in relation to the powers conferred by the Federal Constitution. These differences are legitimate subjects of discussion. Because I hold one view of the Constitution, I have no right to refuse a hearing to an opposite view, respectfully presented. Senators and Representatives are not above the People. When respectable citizens submit to them a petition, the presumption is that they believe their request reasonable, and believe that Congress has power to grant what they pray for. Senators and Representatives may hold different opinions—but this is no reason for refusing to entertain the petition. If they may refuse to receive it because they believe they have no power to grant its prayer, they may do the same thing, because they regard the prayer unreasonable or inexpedient. Refusal to receive in the latter case would be no greater abridgement of the right of petition, than it would be in the former. The right of petition on one side presupposes the duty of receiving on the other. A Senator believes the thing asked for, improper—the petitioner believes it proper. Very well; let the former first hear, then consider, and then state to the petitioner why he declines to grant his prayer. Senators believe they have no power to do a certain act; certain petitioners, believing that they have, ask them to do it. What is the plain duty of the former? To hear, to consider, and then to state to the petitioner their decision, with the reasons therefor.

We know that such is the opinion of the great majority of the American People. Such was the view of John Quincy Adams, which, through many years of toil and persecution, he continually urged upon the House of Representatives, until at last he procured the abrogation of the twenty-first rule, and reestablished, so far as that branch of the National Legislature was concerned, the right of petition.

Against this view, the Senate of the United States, three members alone excepted, has planted itself. It has assumed authority to abridge the right of petition. Messrs. Davis and Webster, Senators from a State, whose most intrepid son was the warm sympathizer of the world by his heroic struggle for the restoration of this sacred right, now pour contempt upon his memory, by virtually charging him with folly. For, if a legislative body may refuse to consider, to hear, to receive petitions from the People, because it thinks that such action would be unconstitutional, it has no power to grant their prayer, we should like to know what John Quincy Adams contended for?

We hope the People will observe the position of these gentlemen, and of the other Senators from the free States. They do not want a Dissolution of the Union, but they know that the best way to strengthen the popular feeling against it, is to observe scrupulously, sacredly, all the guarantees of rights in the Constitution. They may doubt whether Congress has the right to propose any plan of Dissolution, and would regard with abhorrence any attempt on its part to do so, but in all this they will find reasons, not for refusing to receive petitions on the subject, but for sternly rejecting their prayer. They will recognise no authority in an American Senator to break down one part of the Constitution on the pretext of preserving integrity of the whole.

### THE SOUTHERN CONVENTION.

The project of a Southern Convention fails to command the unanimous support of the South. The Richmond (Va.) *Whig* is evidently hostile to it, but acquiesces in the modified report of the committee on the subject in the Virginia Legislature, which merely recommends the appointment of delegates by the People, and does not propose to amend by substituting a substitute, contemplating, for example, the formation of two separate Unions.

The same paper says that the press of all parties in Western Virginia is out against the movement.

The Raleigh (N. C.) *Register* asks—  
"What, then, is the Convention to be called for? Why do not the individuals who are pressing the movement tell us what is the object? Until satisfied on this point, the State should hesitate a long time before committing itself by the hands of a few men, to abide by whatever course they may think proper to adopt."

The Greenboro' (N. C.) *Patriot* says—  
"If dissolution is not aimed at, we do not clearly see the necessity for the Convention. It could effect no more perfect unanimity of sentiment than exists at present, and could not express Southern sentiment more strongly than it has already been done by the Legislatures of all the Southern States."

"If dissolution is the object of the Convention, we submit that the State of North Carolina will hardly be committed to the project by a set of irresponsible delegates. They must be clothed with more authority and go under more solemn sanctions than can be conferred by the usual hazy process of court-house and cross-roads meetings."

The National Intelligencer, which is laboring manfully for the preservation of the Union, contains, in its edition of the 16th, extracts from twenty-three prominent Southern newspapers, in Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri, expressing the most devoted attachment to the Union, and hostility to all projects of Disunion. From our own exchanges in the South we could add many more.

For one, we shall not condemn in advance the Southern Convention. It will be time enough to denounce it as treasonous, when it shall have committed some overt act. That the People of any section of the country have a perfect right to meet in Convention to consult upon their supposed grievances, and the appropriate remedies for them, no man in his senses will deny. And we have no objection that such Convention should calculate the value of the Union. Americans are a calculating People. We know nothing so sacred that it should command our blind veneration. The Union we would cherish, not as an end, but as a means—a means for the establishment of Justice, Peace, Tranquillity, for the extension and preservation of Free Institutions. Failing in these respects, it would be worthless. We do not believe it has thus failed—it has subserved these high ends, imperfectly it may be, but yet better than any other political organization that could have been formed in this country; and we hope that it will be rendered still more efficacious for the accomplishment of these noble purposes. This is our calculation. Were it not so, did we believe with certain citizens of the North that it was subversive of Justice and Liberty, or with certain citizens of the South that it was used as a mere instrument for the aggrandizement of one section at the expense of another, and the overthrow of State rights, we should be a Disunionist in principle, and stand prepared to aid and defend our convictions.

Let the value of the Union be calculated—we have no fear of the result. Let the Southern Convention be held—let the wisest and best citizens of the South meet to take into consideration the question whether the substantial interests of that section and of the whole country can be promoted by a dissolution of the compact that now binds the States in one Republic. Let them calculate the value of the Union, and the consequences of Disunion. A committee of the ablest men of the South might be constituted to inquire into the relations of the Union, to the consequences of Disunion, to the growth of civilization in this Continent. The Power and Wealth of the Republic. Its exemption from Foreign intrigue and interference.

The Cause of Peace.

The Cause of Free Trade.

The Establishment of Justice and Domestic Tranquillity.

The Maintenance and Extension of Free Institutions.

And also into the probable consequences of Disunion in relation to

Peace, Trade, Social connection between the divided States.

Their Ability to resist Foreign Aggression. The Amount and Cost and Results of the Military Establishments that would then become necessary.

The augmentation of Executive Power at the expense of Popular Sovereignty that would be required in the new Governments.

The Disposition of the Territories of the United States.

The Extradition of Fugitives from Service or Labor.

The Permanence of Slavery.

The Question of the Navigation of the Mississippi River.

And divers other important matters.

It might not be amiss to extend their inquiries a little farther, and ask, how the question of the annexation of the Canadas to the Northern Confederacy, and its relations to the free British West Indies, would be affected; and how, on the other hand, an attempted annexation of Cuba by the Southern Confederacy, without any naval power, would be viewed by Great Britain.

We repeat, it would gratify us exceedingly to see all these important Questions fully and ably examined by a Committee of the ablest Statesmen of the South, appointed by the Nashville Convention. Their report, we have no doubt, would do more to settle the agitation in the South in regard to the Union, than indignant Senatorial denunciations of the schemes of Disunion, and patriotic Southern rejections of petitions for Dissolution.

The very best thing that can be done to perpetuate the Union is, calmly and carefully to calculate its value.

### BLUNDERS.

Members of Congress do not always speak by the book. We have sometimes wondered at the coolness with which they make the most unfounded statements.

Mr. Inge of Alabama, a few days since, while speculating on the advantages to the South of a dissolution of the Union, fell into several gross mistakes. A few we shall advert to, as mere specimens:

"Our exports," he says, "are now about double those of the North."

The following table from official returns will show the value of exports from the free States and slave States in the year ending June 30th, 1848:

Free States \$58,727,716 \$19,287,725 \$76,145,441  
Slave States 76,176,485 47,441,591 123,618,076

In relation to the total value of exports, the two sections are nearly equal. As to regards the exports of domestic produce, more than two-fifths is from the free States, less than three-fifths from the slaveholding. What becomes of Mr. Inge's statement, that the South exports double the amount exported by the North?

Again, of the exports credited to the South, forty millions' worth is set down to the account of Louisiana; but at least one-half of this comes from the free States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa, a large portion of the produce of which is sent to New Orleans for exportation; so that the value of exports of domestic produce of the free States is really twenty millions greater than that of similar exports from the slaveholding States.

The same enlightened gentleman also remarks: "The Federal Government raises annually from imports more than thirty millions of dollars, which go into the National Treasury; and indirectly an immense amount of money is sent to the benefit of Northern manufacturers. This revenue is expended chiefly in the North; and while the South pays tribute to this Government, she is scarcely permitted to share in the largess."

In the first place, as the North numbers about twelve millions of consumers, while the South numbers scarcely more than nine millions; and as two-thirds of the white people, who are by far the most numerous, reside in the North, it is obvious that the North pays, relatively, the larger portion of the burdens imposed by the shape of customs. And in the second place, it is sheer folly to assert that this revenue is expended chiefly in the North; for of the whole thirty millions, three millions are expended in support of the various Departments of the Government in Washington, and of the Diplomatic intercourse of the country; nearly twenty millions in the support of the military and naval establishments; and three millions for miscellaneous objects, in which the States are equally interested; while the rest goes to the payment of the interest on the public debt, the most of which has been contracted in the attempt to please the people of Florida, by expelling the Indians, and in the prosecution of a war with Mexico, brought about by Southern influences.

These are mere specimens of the reckless statements which are so common in the Halls of Congress, that they have ceased to excite the surprise of the experienced members of that body.

### VIOLENT RESISTANCE THREATENED WITHIN THE HALLS OF CONGRESS.

The threats of violent resistance to the passage of any act, which the pro-slavery men may deem unfavorable to their interests, is quite common in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Davis of Mississippi thought it best, if Northern men persisted in their policy, that the conflict should begin "here and now"—that is, in the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. Clingman, alluding to some suggestion made as he said in a Northern paper, that members determined to organize the House should be expelled, declared that the Northern members to try their hands at such a measure, administered them this "slaveholding territory"—our own territory—and that such an attempt would not have a quarrel to do business!

Some other Southern member—We forget his name—intimated that, in the event of a conflict, in a few moments three hundred armed men would make their appearance in the Hall of the House.

Mr. Inge of Alabama was even more palpable. From the closing paragraph of his speech, delivered the other day in the House, we extract the following open invitation to civil war:

"From this consideration alone, the present admission of California would meet with determined and unmeasured resistance. Will the representatives of the North attempt, by the power of numbers, to outrange the Constitution and degrade the South by the admission of this Territory as a State, without the offer of some equivalent? I suggest to them to remember that we are sworn to support the Constitution, and could scarcely do so, as we are now, without a shameful violation. The attempted consummation of such an act would be the overthrow of the Constitution, which the people we represent would resist by force of arms. We are here as the representatives of the people, but we are not here as the representatives of individual citizens, who, in the aggregate, are the people? We assume obligations which we come as representatives; but we are relieved from them when we are present as private citizens?"

My individual opinion is, that if the Southern people ought to resist a measure of aggression, after its consummation, we have no doubt the same or a higher obligation to resist its consummation. These suggestions are made, not in the name of the Constitution, but in the name of the Southern people, who, in the aggregate, are the people? We assume obligations which we come as representatives; but we are relieved from them when we are present as private citizens?"

My individual opinion is, that if the Southern people ought to resist a measure of aggression, after its consummation, we have no doubt the same or a higher obligation to resist its consummation. These suggestions are made, not in the name of the Constitution, but in the name of the Southern people, who, in the aggregate, are the people? We assume obligations which we come as representatives; but we are relieved from them when we are present as private citizens?"

My individual opinion is, that if the Southern people ought to resist a measure of aggression, after its consummation, we have no doubt the same or a higher obligation to resist its consummation. These suggestions are made, not in the name of the Constitution, but in the name of the Southern people, who, in the aggregate, are the people? We assume obligations which we come as representatives; but we are relieved from them when we are present as private citizens?"

My individual opinion is, that if the Southern people ought to resist a measure of aggression, after its consummation, we have no doubt the same or a higher obligation to resist its consummation. These suggestions are made, not in the name of the Constitution, but in the name of the Southern people, who, in the aggregate, are the people? We assume obligations which we come as representatives; but we are relieved from them when we are present as private citizens?"

My individual opinion is, that if the Southern people ought to resist a measure of aggression, after its consummation, we have no doubt the same or a higher obligation to resist its consummation. These suggestions are made, not in the name of the Constitution, but in the name of the Southern people, who, in the aggregate, are the people? We assume obligations which we come as representatives; but we are relieved from them when we are present as private citizens?"

My individual opinion is, that if the Southern people ought to resist a measure of aggression, after its consummation, we have no doubt the same or a higher obligation to resist its consummation. These suggestions are made, not in the name of the Constitution, but in the name of the Southern people, who, in the aggregate, are the people? We assume obligations which we come as representatives; but we are relieved from them when we are present as private citizens?"

My individual opinion is, that if the Southern people ought to resist a measure of aggression, after its consummation, we have no doubt the same or a higher obligation to resist its consummation. These suggestions are made, not in the name of the Constitution, but in the name of the Southern people, who, in the aggregate, are the people? We assume obligations which we come as representatives; but we are relieved from them when we are present as private citizens?"

My individual opinion is, that if the Southern people ought to resist a measure of aggression, after its consummation, we have no doubt the same or a higher obligation to resist its consummation. These suggestions are made, not in the name of the Constitution, but in the name of the Southern people, who, in the aggregate, are the people? We assume obligations which we come as representatives; but we are relieved from them when we are present as private citizens?"

be reasonable men enough in Congress from both sections, to take proper care of those who should attempt to regulate its deliberations by the Bowie-Kalfe.

### THE COMPROMISE OF MR. CLAY.

The compromise resolutions of Mr. Clay are generally repudiated by the Whig press. His motives are commended, his courage, patriotism, and ability, are admired, but his plan finds scarcely any favor. The Whig papers of Ohio are nearly all decided in their condemnation of it. The Ohio State Journal, of Columbus, says:

"The resolutions of Mr. Clay are producing a profound impression on the public mind. They will be read with great interest throughout the length and breadth of this land. There can be no mistake about their reception in Ohio. With all their regard for Mr. Clay, with all their admiration for his splendid career as a statesman, and his long and valuable services as a Whig, our citizens do not endorse the sentiments of his resolutions. They say this 'more in sorrow than in anger;' but say it they must, though it severs ties long existing and dearly cherished."

Proceeding these remarks, says the Cincinnati Gazette:

"We had a call for a public meeting of the Whigs of Franklin county, and of the State, to be held at Columbus, on Monday evening next, 'for the purpose of obtaining an interchange of opinion, and an expression of sentiment in reference to the proposed compromise of Congress on the subject of slavery; and especially in reference to the resolutions recently introduced by Mr. Clay on that subject in the Senate of the United States; to utter the voice of the people of Ohio, at this important crisis.'"

That is right. The people of the free States have been repeating quietly, in the belief that their representatives in Congress would carry out their oft-expressed determination on this question. Now, that they see some of them giving way, and others entertaining insidious plans of compromise, they will gird themselves again for the conflict. Cragg-headed representatives may waver, but the people who sent them here have no fear of slaveholding and disunion conventions. We do not believe that they will abandon the ground they have taken, whatever the consequences may be.

It can be no degradation to the South, to preserve by act of Congress freedom in free Territories. It will be an infamy to the North, should they suffer free to be converted into slave Territory. It can be no degradation to the South to apply the Jefferson Ordinance of 1787 to Free Soil; it will be a perpetual degradation to the North, should it suffer itself to be driven by intimidation to an abandonment of the Ordinance.

GENERAL CASS AND THE RIGHT OF PETITION.

We hope our readers will pay some attention to the report of the debate in the Senate on the Right of Petition, published on our fourth page. The course of General Cass is grossly inconsistent.

On the 6th, on account of the proceedings of a meeting in North Carolina, remonstrating against action by the United States designed to limit slavery, and threatening disunion in a certain contingency, was presented by Mr. Mangum. The usage of the Senate has been, to raise the question of reception on all papers touching the question of slavery, except where emanating from State Legislatures, and to lay that question upon the table. Among the most rigid in the observance of the usage is General Cass. Mr. Hale, although opposed to the usage, deemed the occasion offered by the presentation of these proceedings a fit one for testing the impartiality of the Senate towards North and South, and accordingly raised the question of reception, and moved to lay that question on the table. The motion was lost.

Messrs. Douglas and Bradbury alone voting for it. General Cass, so prompt in voting against all petitions, memorials, or remonstrances, on the subject, coming from the free States, with his accustomed reverence for the South, voted to receive these proceedings from North Carolina? The very next day, Mr. Hale presented the report of the proceedings of an association of Friends in Philadelphia, containing the following prayer:

"We, however, ask you, possessing, as you do, the legislative power, to prevent the increase of this dreadful evil, by the non-admission of new Territories into the Union, or the non-erecting of new Territories whose constitutions or organic laws do not contain express prohibitions against the extension of the continuance of slavery within their limits."

Here was a petition asking the Senate not to act in any way for the extension of slavery. The question of reception was raised, and on the motion to lay that question on the table, General Cass voted *yes*.

Thus, one day he votes to receive the proceedings of a North Carolina meeting, praying Congress not to act against the extension of slavery, and the next day he votes against receiving the proceedings of a Philadelphia meeting, praying Congress not to act for the extension of slavery.

A very consistent, fair-minded, impartial statesman, is he not?

Mr. Hale thus exposed this gross inconsistency.

"The honorable Senator, in the discrimination which he applies to papers to be received by the Senate, says, if they ask that which we have palpably no power to grant, they should not be received; but he says, if any of the citizens of this country apprehend action on the part of Congress which they think will be dangerous and detrimental, they have a right to remonstrate against such action, and to ask Congress to receive that remonstrance. How frail, sir, is human memory! On Thursday last, I had the honor to present precisely such a paper as that to this body—the remonstrance of some members of the association of Friends—coming here, and not asking for any action on the part of Congress, but simply, in the words of the honorable Senator from Michigan, remonstrating against action which they anticipated—the admission of any more slave States, or the extension of slavery into new Territories."

"Mr. Cass. The object of that petition was to induce Congress not to admit any new States into the Union without a prohibition of slavery."

"Mr. Hale. No, sir, that was not it. It was a petition against action, and to resist that action laid down by the honorable Senator from Michigan. I appeal to every Senator who hears me, if that is not the case? It is a difference of words between us; but I ask the common sense of the Senate, to decide which is right."

"Mr. Cass. Was not the object to prevent California, or any other new State, from being admitted into the Union without such a prohibition? It was asking us to do what we could not do—that is all. I have not another word to say."

"Mr. Hale. It was remonstrating against action."

There was another rule General Cass laid down, which he coolly disregarded in practice. In his speech he said—

"If we have no power to grant the prayer of the petition, why should such a petition be received? And our time should not be squandered by devoting to useful and national purposes. I am not speaking, sir, of a doubtful question of petitions for measures of doubtful validity, and about which reasonable men may differ, and do differ. These should be received with respect and consideration. But I speak of applications for the exercise of powers which we have clearly and undeniably no right to assume—like this for the admission of the Union, or for the annihilation of a State of this Confederacy."

Petitions for measures of doubtful validity ought he says, to be respectfully received and considered. The petition, the question of reception of which he voted to lay on the table, asked Congress not to admit any State, or erect any Territory, whose organic law did not prohibit slavery. The great majority of the people of this country believe in the validity of such non-action; a minority denies it. Even some of the minority hold that Congress have the power to admit new States or refuse them admission, at its discretion. The first resolution of the series submitted by Mr. Foote, is as follows:

"Resolved, That Congress possesses, under the Constitution, full and exclusive power to admit or refuse to admit new States into the Union, of its own discretion, which discretion, though often in no case to be exercised arbitrarily, unjustly, or capriciously, is nevertheless a power to be exercised in accordance with the principles of the Constitution, and to the injury or disparagement of any of its reserved rights."

In view of these considerations, the non-action prayed for by the petition, being held valid by a

majority of the people, and invalid by a minority, must be regarded by General Cass as coming within the category of measures desired by him to be of doubtful or questionable validity. And, therefore, on his own principle, he was bound respectfully to receive and consider the petition.

But the remark of Mr. Hale, in relation to the Senate generally, applies with special force to General Cass: "the usage is to receive everything from the South, and reject everything from the North, without asking the nature of it."

### For the National Era.

#### SABBATH MORNING.

BY MISS PHOEBE CARY.

Another Sabbath over the earth  
Comes softly from Eden's towers  
And in our spirit I can feel  
The hallowed influence of its hours.

And now this earnest prayer goes up  
That God may light our way—  
O God, that I might give, to-day,  
My heart, and life, and soul, to thee!

I, that by parental love was brought  
From the cold world of sin,  
And from a Savior's pleading arms  
Went backward to a world of sin—

Went back to find a deeper shame,  
A threatened reckoning, yet more dread,  
For all the slighted prayers and tears  
Poured out upon my guilty head.

Yet, Lord, thy cup of vengeance stay,  
Hold thy uplifted hand divine,  
Till, by repentance at the cross,  
My heart be bent to thine.

Grant that thy trembling steps may be  
Set firmly on the Rock of Right,  
Before thy striving spirit takes  
Its upward, everlasting flight.

I am weak, would I had the angel's feet,  
Nor still without his blessing go,  
Since the sweet mercy offered now  
May be the latest sent below.

And should this earthly Sabbath be  
The last my dying soul may keep,  
Oh, shall another dawn for me,  
When the sunbeams break my sleep!

### HEARING FROM THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

We published a few weeks ago extracts from newspapers in the districts of Messrs. Duer and Clarke, rebuking them for their votes to lay the resolution of Mr. Root on the table, when it was first introduced.

Mr. Gilmore of Pennsylvania, who pursued a similar course, is thus noticed in the *Blairsville (Pa.) Apollonian* of January 23d:

OUR REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS.  
Messrs. Editors of the *Northwestern Era*,—Mr. Gilmore, the Representative in Congress from this district, has pledged to the Free Soil men of the district, to vote with the South, on the subject of Mr. Root's resolution on the table—it being that vote on the Wilcox Provision. As you have supported him and assisted in getting him elected, I think it your duty to call on him for an explanation of his vote on this occasion. He certainly could not have been elected in this district if we had known that he was opposed to the Wilcox Provision being applied to our free Territories; and I call upon you as honest men to let the Democracy of this district see how Gilmore votes—how he fulfills his pledge.